

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/669,051

Applicant(s)

FRANANO, NICOLAS F.

Examiner

DR. Kailash C. Srivastava

Art Unit

1651

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DR. Kailash C. Srivastava, Examiner.

(3) Ms. Lisa Hazzard, Applicant's Representative.

(2) Mr. Christopher Tate, Examiner.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11/05/2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: None.

Claim(s) discussed: Those of Record.

Identification of prior art discussed: That of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed modifications to applicant's proposed amendments (attached) to possibly overcome the prior art of record cited in previous Office Action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

**Tate, Christopher**

**From:** lhazard@ealaw.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 05, 2002 3:08 PM  
**To:** christopher.tate@uspto.gov  
**Subject:** Proposed claims

USSN: 09/669,051  
PROPOSED CLAIMS FOR DISCUSSION (NOVEMBER 5, 2002 INTERVIEW)

1. A method for treating an obstructed biological conduit, comprising administering to the wall of the biological conduit an agent that can degrade the extracellular matrix of obstructing tissue, wherein administration of the agent results in proteolysis of elastin and/or elastin microfibers in the wall of the biological conduit leading to enlargement of the diameter of the biological conduit.
2. A method for modifying the diameter of a biological conduit comprising administering to the wall of the biological conduit an agent and allowing the agent to proteolyse elastin and/or elastin microfibers in the biological conduit wall leading to enlargement of the diameter of the biological conduit.
3. A method for modifying the diameter of a biological conduit comprising administering to the wall of the biological conduit an agent that can proteolyse elastin and/or elastin microfibers in the biological conduit wall whereby the agent causes temporary and partial degradation of elastin and/or elastin microfibers in the biological conduit wall which reduces the elasticity of the conduit wall so that the diameter of the conduit may be modified.
4. A method for modifying the diameter of a biological conduit comprising:  
reducing the elasticity of the conduit wall by administering an agent to the wall of the biological conduit whereby the agent is capable of proteolysing elastin and/or elastin microfibers in the biological conduit;

allowing the agent to cause partial degradation of elastin and/or elastin microfibers in the biological conduit wall; and modifying the diameter of the biological conduit.